encouragement for the people to realize their responsibilities. This, therefore, cannot be claimed as a matter of right. The idea is, that people must undertake these works themselves.

Mr. Shamiengar and another member.—The contribution from ryots for village improvement should be done away with as in many instances the grants from Government lapse owing to the failure of the villagers to pay their share of the contribution. The total grant for village improvement might with advantage be divided among all the villages without any contribution being expected from them.

Mr. Vema Reddy—Per contra.—If the request is granted, the enthusiasm on the part of the people will subside. So the present rule requiring contribution for improvement work from villagers is all right. Rather than do away with the contribution altogether as suggested by some of the members, it would be better to reduce the contribution from one-half to one-third and pay the balance of two-thirds from Government.

Dewan.—Cannot be done.

SUBJECT No. 33.

Supervision over tanks.

Messrs. Ramakrishna Iyer, Kolar Taluk; T. Srinivasachar, Kolar Municipality and Venkatarayappa, Chikballapur Municipality.

As the present Marahmat Department has not been as brisk as it ought to be in restoring minor tanks it may be amalgamated with the Public Works Department proper.

Dewan.—The question is under consideration.

SUBJECT No. 34.

Levy of assessment on improvements by the holder of the land.

Messrs. Chikka Rama Reddi, Bagepalli Taluk and Venkatarayappa; Chikballapur Municipality.

Mr. Chika Rama Reddy.—Even when wells are sunk by ryots themselves in dry lands and *bagayet* crops are raised by them, it is hard to levy wet or garden rate. Dry rate of *kandayam* may be levied in such cases.

Mr. C. Sreenivasa Rao.—We remember the promise once made by Government that no cess would be levied on lands fed by wells sunk by private capital.

Another Member.—In the case of tanks, Government have to incur some expenditure on account of supervision etc., but in the case of wells sunk in *Khushki* lands, no such expenditure is incurred by Government who should therefore collect nothing from the raiyats.

Superintendent of Revenue Survey.—Wells may be sunk by the raiyats but water is not created by them. The wells are fed by tanks and only such of the *khushki* lands as raise *bagayat* crops with the indirect help of water from tanks are charged higher

rates and not others. The rates thus charged are nowhere above the *khushki* maximum. Government will be glad to reconsider cases of excessive levy and generally the cess is enhanced only where increased water supply is afforded.

Mr. Vema Reddy.—After a well is sunk in a dry land, the water in any of the tanks in its vicinity may get dried up and this matter of chance may serve as a plea for levying *bagayat* rates. So a definite distance from tanks etc., may be fixed for purposes of this levy.

Supeintendent of Revenue Survey.—It is not possible to fix the distance.

Mr. D. S. Hanumantha Rao.—*Kushki* rates, though high by themselves are further enhanced if wells are sunk at the cost of the raiyats. This dissuades the raiyats from sinking wells. Secondly, wells fed by water from the tanks are not fit for irrigation purposes. So, *kandayam* may be levied only on lands in *Nadi-salu* or *halladasalu*.

Mr. Kannasettappa.—Even in Kolar District, *bagayat* rates range from Rs. 5. to Rs. 6. These are very heavy. Mulberry planters who raise crops with the help of small wells have also to pay the irrigation cess.

Superintendent of Revenue Survey.—They raise six crops a year and make enormous profits and it is only right that they should pay the tax.

Mr. Gopalaswami Iyer.—The Madras Government have passed a rule to the effect that if raiyats sink wells and raise crops with their help, no *kandayam* should be levied.

Dewan.—The rules are all right though there might be inequalities in application. The Superintendent of Revenue Survey will be asked to enquire into such cases.

SUBJECT No. 35.

Inclusion of the name of the representative of a deceased joint *Khatedar* in the *Khate* or the sub-division of the portion belonging to the deceased *Khatedar*, even though such land should be less than the minimum.

Mr. N. Srinivasa Iyengar, Seringapatam Taluk.

Mr. N. Srinivasa Iyengar.—When a joint *khatedar* dies, the name of his legal representative is not entered in the *khate* and he thus goes without any authority to rely upon for his title. This leads to trouble. He will have to go in many cases to Civil Courts to establish his claim for the land.

Revenue Commissioner.—There may be too many joint *khatedars*. It may not be possible for a single *khate* to show all their names. The present system is being adopted only for the convenience of Government. If, as the member suggests, all the names of joint